

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 6-10 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Gray (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,353). Claims 4-5 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Specification**

The Applicant amended the paragraph beginning on line 23 of page 4 to correct a grammatical error by replacing the word “is” with “it” in line 3.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gray (United States Patent No. 6,049,353). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner contends that “Gray discloses a wire harness apparatus for remote use with a camera node array having a plurality of camera nodes sharing a common set of conductors on a cable...” The Examiner states that Gray discloses “a remote signal conversion means, connected to one end of said conductor means, for connection to a general-purpose remote interface to access and control the plurality of camera nodes, and for conversion between single-ended signals at said general purpose remote interface and differential signals on said conductor means” and directs the Applicant to Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 of Gray for support thereof. The Examiner further

states that "Gray discloses the specifics of the processor 300 and the computer 400 in that the camera 110 obtains images and there is [a] camera ID embedded to signify a camera node for the corresponding camera, and in Fig. 1, that there is [a] remote interface to access and control the plural camera nodes via [the] network to other computers."

Gray arguably discloses a computer network for processing digitized, compressed security camera video, however it does not disclose the wire harness apparatus of the present invention. Gray discloses the use of a computer 400 that transmits video signals to processor 300 via data bus 380. (*See*, col. 4, lines 54-67 and col. 5, lines 1-13). Regardless of whether or not Gray discloses a remote interface to access and control the plural camera nodes, Gray does not disclose "a remote signal conversion means...for conversion between single-ended signals at said general purpose remote interface and differential signals on said conductor means." In particular, Gray makes no mention of "a remote signal conversion means that provides conversion of single-ended signals and differential signals" as recited in presently pending claim 1.

The Examiner further directs the Applicant to Fig. 2 as disclosing a local signal conversion means connected to the opposite end of said conductor means. In particular, the Examiner directs the Applicant to "element 310 of processor 300 as the decoder that locally decodes image data obtained by camera 110, thus image data obtained can be interfaced to the computer 400 for the user to view." In order for the system of Gray to capture and hold data from a plurality of cameras whose pictures arrive randomly with respect to one another ...some timing means is necessary so that the encoding and decoding of data takes place on the same horizontal line in the same vertical interval for each camera." (*See* col. 6, lines 14-20.) Gray goes on to discuss

the use of timing modules to process the incoming signals with respect to serial and parallel data processing. (See col. 6, lines 21-67.) Gray only discloses serial and parallel data processing, however, and makes no mention of “conversion between differential signals and single-ended signals” as recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Gray does not disclose each and every element of pending claim 1. Because claims 2-8 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and in view of the arguments presented above with respect to independent claim 1, claims 2-8 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-8 is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 as anticipated by Gray. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner contends that Gray discloses “selecting the next frame of video from the next adjacent camera node within the array if no activity is present such that all nodes source a single frame in succession if no activity is present” and directs the Applicant to Fig. 2 for support thereof. The Examiner states that Gray discloses “vertical interval timing units [are] utilized along with alarm sensors for detecting alarm conditions or activity while observing the monitored area.” Gray arguably discloses that the “decoded data from the video signal is loaded into alarm and camera identification interfaces 320 and 330 whose outputs are connected to a data bus 380...” Gray does not mention, however, selecting the next frame of video if no activity is present as recited in presently pending claim 9. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Gray does not disclose each and every element of pending claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 9 is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner also rejected claim 10 as anticipated by Gray. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner contends that Gray discloses

“embedding the unique number onto each frame of the video signal during the interval such that the unique number may be retrieved from the video signal” and directs the Applicant to Fig. 2 for support thereof. In particular, the Examiner states that Fig. 2 of Gray discloses the “specifics of the processor and the computer in that the camera 110 obtains images and there is a camera ID embedded to signify a camera node for the corresponding camera.” Gray does not disclose, however, “embedding the unique number onto each frame of the video signal.” Arguably, Gray discloses an encoder 200 that encodes the camera identification and the status of the alarm sensors 100 into the video signal from the camera 110.” (See column 5, lines 48-50.) Gray does not disclose, however, embedding this camera ID onto each frame as recited in presently pending claim 10. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Gray does not disclose each and every element of pending claim 10. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Entry of the present amendment and/or allowance of the presently pending claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action’s rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-3387 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 with the enclosed Credit Card Payment Form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John F. Kacvinsky', written over a horizontal line.

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: 7/19/05